



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

11/9  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/725,974	12/02/2003	Santosh Savekar	15148US02	4960

23446 7590 01/22/2008  
MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD  
500 WEST MADISON STREET  
SUITE 3400  
CHICAGO, IL 60661

EXAMINER
----------

TAYONG, HELENE E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/22/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/725,974	SAVEKAR ET AL.
	Examiner Helene Tayong	Art Unit 2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 11/6/07.

Claims 1-18 are presently pending and stand rejected. Claims 19-21 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1-18 are pending in this application and have been considered below.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to rejection of claims 1-6, 11-12, and 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kono , rejection of claims 7, 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kono et al (US 20010005398 A1) in view of Jiang et al (US 6614441) and rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kono et al in view of Xiang et al (US 20070153133 A1) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner thoroughly reviewed Applicant's arguments but firmly believes that the cited reference reasonably and properly meets the claimed limitation as rejected.

**(1) Applicant's arguments:** "*Kono does not teach a display manager for determining when to overwrite an existing image in the image buffers, and providing a signal to the decoder indicating when to overwrite the existing image in the frame buffer; and wherein the decoder overwrites the existing image after receiving the signal"*

**The examiner's response:** Kono in (figure 6, 55) discloses a display control section that analyzes the content of the parameters that have been read, and determines how to display the picture (step S15 in figure 7). On (page 6, [0080]-[0061]), Kono further disclosed that parameters of each layer that have been generated as a

result of the decoding are **overwritten** into the parameters stored in the MB buffer 58 (step s6 figure 7). Then the parameters are transferred from the MB buffer to the parameter bank, and are written into this parameter bank.

**(2) Applicant's arguments:** "*Kono does not teach wherein the second processor is off- chip from the integrated circuit*".

**The examiner's response:** Kono et al. discloses in (fig. 6) an integrated circuit comprises the first processor (53) and first memory (51). Kono et al fails to teach wherein the second processor is off-chip from the integrated circuit.

However, Jiang et al in the same field of endeavor teaches wherein the second processor is off-chip from the integrated circuit as recited in claim 7 (col. 9, lines 44-47)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have utilized the method of Jiang et al in the method of Kono et al in order to process video data in a computer system. The motivation to utilize Jiang's method in the method of Kono et al's method would be to reduce cost and burdensome in terms of processor cycles required while increasing the likelihood of display quality problems in heavy loaded systems ( col.1, lines 50-54).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-6, 11-12 and 13-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kono et al (US 20010005398 A1).

(1) with regards to claims 1,13,15,16 and18;

Kono et al teaches a method (Fig .6) for displaying images on a display comprising:

a decoder (52) for decoding encoded images and parameters associated with the images (pg.5, [0066], lines 3-5).

image buffers (58) for storing the decoded images pg. 5, [0066], lines 7-10) ;

parameter buffers (53) for storing the decoded parameters associated with the decoded images( pg. 5, [0067], lines 2-6) ; and

a display manager (55) for determining when to overwrite an existing image in the image buffers and providing a signal to the decoder indicating when to overwrite the existing image in the frame buffer( pg.6,[0075] and [0080]-[0081]); and

wherein the decoder overwrites the existing image after receiving the signal ( pg.6, [0081], lines 4-7).

(2) with regards to claim 2;

The second reference further discloses wherein the set of parameters includes a parameter indicating when the system is utilizing a technique requiring selective images to be displayed more than once (pg. 6, [0086], lines 7-11).

(3) with regards to claim 3 ;

wherein the system for displaying images on a display further comprises:

a first processor ( 54);

a second processor ( 55);

a first memory (58);

a second memory(53); and

wherein the first memory stores an instruction set for the decoder (pg.6, [0079]).

(4) with regards to claim 4;

wherein the first processor (54) executes the instruction for the decoder(pg. 6, [0081] lines 3-4).

(5) with regards to claim 5;

wherein the second memory stores (53) an instruction set for the display manager (pg.6, [0085], lines 6-8), the instruction set for the display manager (fig.6, 68) executed by the second processor (pg.6, [0085], lines 8-11),.

(6) with regards to claim 6;

wherein the second processor (55) determines when to overwrite the existing image ( pg. 6, [0084]-[0086]).

(7) with regards to claim 11;

the second memory stores the image buffers (fig. 6, 53d), (pg. 5, [0067]).

(8) with regards to claim 12;

wherein the second memory stores the parameter buffers (fig. 6, 53e), (pg. 6 [0067]).

(9) with regards to claim 13;

a first processor; and

a first memory connected to the processor ( fig. 6, 51, the first memory storing

instructions(pg.6, [0079]). wherein execution of the instructions by the first processor causes:

decoding images; and overwriting an existing image after the processor receives a signal indicating when to overwrite the existing image ( pg. 5, [0080]).

(10) with regards to claim 14;

wherein execution of the instructions by the first processor further causes: displaying the images(fig. 7 and fig.8).

(11) with regards to claim 15;

a second processor connected to the integrated circuit (fig. 6,55); and a second memory connected to the processor (fig. 6, 53), the second memory storing instructions, wherein execution of the instructions by the second processor causes: determining when to overwrite the existing frame ( pg. 5, [0080]); and transmitting the signal to the first processor indicating when to overwrite the existing frame( pg. 5, [0081]).

(12) with regards to claim 16;

wherein execution of the instructions in the first memory by the first processor further causes: decoding parameters associated with the images (pg.6,[0080]).

(13) with regards to claim 17;

examining some of the decoded parameters associated with the images by the second processor ( pg. 6, [0085], lines 10-11).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 7, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kono et al (US 20010005398 A1) in view of Jiang et al (US 6614441).

(1) with regards to claims 7, 8 and 10;

Kono et al. discloses in (fig. 6) an integrated circuit comprises the first processor(53) and first memory ( 51).

Kono et al fails to teach wherein the second processor is off-chip from the integrated circuit.

However, Jiang et al in the same field of endeavor teaches wherein the second processor is off-chip from the integrated circuit as recited in claim 7 (col. 9, lines 44-47) and

The second reference further discloses where the second memory is an off-chip memory as recited in claim 8 (col. 9, lines 44-47)

The second reference further discloses where the second memory is DRAM as recited in claim 10 (col. 9, lines 44-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to utilized the method of Jiang et al in the method of Kono et al in order to process video

data in a computer system. The motivation to add Jiang's method in the method of Kono et al 's method would be to improve on display sequence management in a computer system.

7. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kono et al in view of Xiang et al (US 20070153133 A1).

(1) with regards to claim 9;

Kono et al discloses all of the subject matter disclosed above but fails to teach wherein the first memory is a SRAM;

However, Xiang et al in the same field of endeavor teaches a SRAM (fig. 2, 204).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to utilize the memory of Xiang et al in the method of Kono et al in order to provide a video processing system having a processing unit. The motivation to add Xiang et al 's memory in the method of Kono et al would be to generate random burst addresses for processing of video signal.

### *Conclusion*

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Helene Tayong whose telephone number is 571-270-1675. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 am to 5:30 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Liu Shuwang can be reached on 571-272-3036. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Helene Tayong  
1/16/08

*Shuwang Liu*  
SHUWANG LIU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER